



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

II. DEPARTMENT OF PHILANTHROPY, CHARITIES AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS

The New Jersey State Board of Children's Guardians.—In the year 1897, the governor of New Jersey appointed a commission to investigate the condition of defective, delinquent and dependent children in the state. This commission worked for two years on the problem. After making an investigation and reporting the result to the legislature, the commission looked about to find a remedy for the existing evils. Visits were made to leading child-helping societies all over the country and the different state systems for caring for dependent children were studied. The placing-out system seemed to give the best results.

The commission recommended establishing a State Board of Children's Guardians, which should adopt the placing-out system of caring for its wards and on March 24, 1899, the legislature passed a bill authorizing the appointment of such a board. The board is composed of seven members, two of whom are Roman Catholic and two of whom are women. Members hold office for six years—two members being appointed at the end of every two years. It will be seen that no governor can appoint more than two members, except in cases of death or resignation. They receive no compensation for their services. The board becomes the legal guardian of every child that is made a public charge, such guardianship superseding any rights of the parents so far as its custody is concerned.

A thorough investigation of the circumstances of commitment is made in each case. If no worthy parent or relative can be found the child is placed in an approved family of the same religious faith as its parents, as required by law. The law also stipulates that each child shall be visited quarterly. All children placed out are obliged to attend school according to the laws of the state. To be sure that they do, monthly reports are received from school teachers, showing attendance, standing in studies, the condition of clothes and physical condition. Quarterly reports of attendance are also received from the pastor or priest, in regard to the children's religious instruction.

A great many defective, crippled and sickly children come into the custody of the board. Those physically disabled are placed in the care of a physician, from whom they receive the necessary treatment. The mentally defective children are placed in the proper state institutions.

Children are placed in families either at board, free of charge, or for adoption. The price paid for board is \$1.50 per week and, in addition to this, clothing and medical attendance are provided. Families that take children free are required to board, furnish clothing and medical attendance. Children for adoption are placed on trial for at least six months, after which time, if everything is satisfactory to both parties, the board gives its consent to the adoption, which can be secured through the Orphans' Court. The board has

the right at any time to surrender a child to parents, if this will be for the best interest of the child.

Each year the legislature appropriates a sum of money for the administration of the work. This amount is used for salaries of agents, office expenses and travel in placing, supervising and transferring children. The expense of board, clothing and medical attendance for children placed out is borne by the community from which the child was committed.

Up to October 1, 1903, 1,517 children have come into the care of the board. Of this number, 305 are in boarding homes, 205 in free homes and the remainder, with the exception of twenty in almshouses, have been discharged from custody to parents or relatives.

The placing-out scheme has worked admirably and the benefits of a family life over the artificial life of an institution are marked. The natural family life prepares the child to take his place in the world and compete with others who have had normal home training.¹

Report of Children's Institutions Department, Boston.—An interesting and instructive report has been issued by the Children's Institutions Department of the City of Boston for 1902-03. The delinquent and dependent children becoming public charges in Boston are provided for in one of three ways. Wayward boys committed through the courts are sent to the House of Reformation, maintained by the city on Rainsford Island. Here the youthful offenders are given schooling, taught some useful trade and brought under wholesome moral influences. To the Truant School are sent those children who have become so unmanageable to parents and teachers that it is impossible to keep them in school. This institution, on the cottage plan, aims to combine, with its educational advantage, a good home training and discipline, which most of the children sadly need. The third class dealt with are the dependent and neglected, and for these has been developed a careful placing-out system. The children are watchfully supervised in families, both by regular agents from the city office and by volunteer visitors, who make sure that the children are attending school and church and being kindly treated. Those at board are visited every six weeks and those in free homes every three months. Infants and delicate children are visited monthly by a trained nurse. Mentally defective children are placed in the State Institution for Feeble Minded. At the close of the year there were 391 children in boarding homes and 308 indentured in free homes. The city is able to find country homes for crippled and deformed children by paying higher board, and the effect of healthful surroundings is so excellent that many in time become self-supporting. In glancing at the report, one is impressed by the care taken to ascertain in each case the physical condition of the child and to provide for its necessities. When boys from the House of Reformation leave that institution, they are put upon probation for a time, either in their own homes or at work. Of all those thus on probation at the end of the year, over 54 per cent were doing well and over 24 per cent were doing fairly. A number of boys and girls, former wards of the

¹ Contributed by Seymour H. Stone, Superintendent.

city, have homes of their own and are filling positions of trust and responsibility. Several are graduates of colleges and academies.

Prevention of Cruelty to Children.—A pamphlet entitled "Wie schützen wir die Kinder von Mishandlung und Verbrechen," and published in Vienna, contains an interesting account of the agitation to establish an Austrian Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children. The author is Fräulein Lydia von Wolfring, who, through her reading and observation, became aroused to the widespread suffering of children from abusive and vicious parents, and to the lack of knowledge of the prevalence of this evil on the part of the general public. Miss von Wolfring traveled for a number of months in Italy, Switzerland, France and Austria, investigating court statistics as well as many individual cases of cruelty to children. As a result of her travels she became convinced that vigorous effort should everywhere be made to search out cases of cruelty, arrest and punish the parents and rescue the children. She admits there are many difficulties in the way, such as the strong instinctive feeling on the part of the public that parents have inalienable rights to their children, and the difficulty of presenting absolute evidence in court. She says, however, in no uncertain language, that where parents are degenerate, "modern society may, nay *must*, step between them and their victim." She points out that not to protect a child from the abuse of parents and the evils of a bad home, is only later to have an additional criminal to provide for. She draws plans for an organization for the prevention of cruelty, which shall have headquarters in Vienna with branches all over Austria. Each branch shall have a corps of workers composed of well-known reliable citizens, both men and women, who are to search out all cases of cruelty and report them to the central executive committee at Vienna. Miss von Wolfring speaks of the good work being done in other countries; notably that by the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children in England. During fourteen years this society has handled 281,000 children. Of these, 198,101 were neglected, 45,756 were brutally injured and 8,557 were victims of criminal assault. In 1,423 cases death resulted. In the year 1899 this society rescued 68,000 children, but in 204 cases rescue came too late. The greatest work of the English society is, perhaps, the change it has brought about in the status of the child before the law. The public has acquired an increased sense of responsibility towards the neglected and abused child and laws for its protection have been established and enforced. Miss von Wolfring points out that drunkenness is a great factor in cruelty to children—as is also infant insurance. The English society handled in five years 19,000 children, whose death would have brought the parents 95,000 pounds sterling. She speaks of the good work done by the New York society, and closes with the outline of a plan for establishing an agricultural colony on the cottage or family system, for such children as must be taken from parents, and advocates as near an approach to family life as possible.

At a meeting of the *Rhode Island Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children*, Hon. Elbridge T. Gerry said in substance: The object of this society is the rescue of the child, not its reformation. The child is the client.

The speaker told of the origin of the parent society, in the United States, nearly thirty years ago. The case was that of a little girl in New York who was beaten and maltreated. Attention of Henry Bergh, the philanthropist, was called to this, and the woman who abused the child was punished. After this, complaints became so numerous that Mr. Bergh was obliged to organize a society to take the work in hand. The New York Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children was the first of its kind in the world, but there are now 314 societies in the United States and Canada, either combining with those for the prevention of cruelty to animals, as humane societies, or existing by their specific title.

The great success of the society and its power, depends upon its corporate existence. The three-fold cord, consisting of the legal right to appear and prosecute and be heard, the corporate right to apply the donations of the charitable, and the legacies of the dead, for that purpose, and the earnest zeal of private individuals who give their time, their talents and their money to carry out the views of the society, is not easily broken. The question has been asked, "Why is it that the regularly appointed officers of the law cannot be entrusted with the enforcement of this, as well as other branches of the criminal laws?" The answer is very simple. They are necessarily occupied with the protection of the entire community and their attention is given very properly to the duties of preserving the peace of the public, and in arresting and prosecuting cases of felony.

Governor Garvin stated that originally the entire care and authority over a child rested with the parents, and perhaps this was better so. Even now there are some people who believe that the sole government should be left with parents, but the state now interferes to protect children against immoral and physical abuses.

The report of the society showed that it is doing a very effective work. Children are taken and cared for, and given a home until they are of quite mature age. Most of them are placed, not in institutions, but in private homes, a great and undoubted advantage, if these homes are what they should be and of course the officers of the society know that they are proper persons. The work is necessary and promising. As Mr. Gerry said: "A single child saved makes the expenditure of money worth while. Knowing that the work is bringing forth good, the society should be given the support of the public in the execution of its noble work."

Home Life versus Institution Life has been discussed very largely during the last six months by the daily papers of the country. There is a general desire for information in regard to home placing. In an article which recently appeared in the *New York American* the following statements were made:

"A little girl, fourteen years old, set fire to a barn in Poughkeepsie, in New York State. She is locked up as a criminal. The child had spent her life in an asylum for orphans until very recently, when she was taken as a servant by Mrs. _____. The child's photograph shows an average good face. She is kind-hearted enough, as is shown in the fact that she drove all the chickens out of the barn before setting fire to it; she said she could not bear to see them burn up. She confessed willingly that she set fire to the

barn because she wanted to have the excitement of seeing the fire engines come. This young girl will now be returned to her orphan asylum. She will go back to a scheme of life which is largely the cause of her disordered cravings, to a kind of life that ruins with its dull routine hundreds of thousands of children.

"In a big asylum, no matter how good the intentions of the management or how kind the attendants, the lives of the unfortunate children are dull beyond belief. Everything is routine, common-place, dead-level monotony. They sleep all in uniform little beds side by side, they get up, go to bed, eat, walk—do everything in one monotonous routine. And worst of all, nothing is left to their own initiative, to their own imaginations. All that makes up the happiness of an ordinary child is unknown to these poor children whom unworthy parentage or bad social conditions force into the asylums. They do not know the individual care and affection of a mother and a father. They lack the excitement that other little girls find in their dolls, or that other little boys find in dogs and rabbits and enterprises of all kinds. Within there is a craving for the amusements and interests that ought to make up the life of a child. It is no wonder that, occasionally, when suddenly freed from this horrible monotony, poor asylum children go to extremes. Then they are called criminals and returned to their prison, whereas in reality the real criminal is the fate that condemns them to a dull prison life.

"Abandoned children or others that find their way to the asylums are looked upon, although unjustly, as necessarily inferior human beings. If they were inferior it would certainly be a sacred duty, for their sake and for the sake of others, to lift them up as far as possible. This can only be done by endeavoring to individualize their lives, to give them interests, industrial and others, to bring them in contact with the children outside of the asylums. They should not be dressed in monotonous uniforms. They should all be sent to the regular open public schools. In this latter respect some of the Jewish institutions show exceptional intelligence. They send the children from their asylums to the regular public schools. It is no wonder that these children from the Jewish asylums outclass in success, subsequently, the children from institutions which condemn them to dull inside routine.

"If the boy of the asylum could go to the public school each day, mixing with other boys for several hours, going through the city street sharing the general life of the country, he would certainly be better able to compete with the world when released from his charitable prison. It will probably be said that some of the boys might run away. They would not run far; the world is none too ready to take care of runaway asylum children. Even if a few did escape from the asylum life, no great harm would be done, and much good would be done by improvement of the others.

"We build now imposing asylums for children, great structures of brick and stone, with high stone walls all around them. And many of us look at these institutions with admiration, imagining them to be beneficial. They are beneficial in one way, as they relieve the outside world of its burden and responsibility. But every one of them is a dismal prison house in which human souls are crushed, kept down and deprived of future possibilities by

deadly monotony. No wonder that the five children of Jean Jacques Rousseau, who went to the asylum for abandoned children, were never heard of afterward. Rousseau himself would never have been heard of had his youth been passed in such an asylum, instead of being passed in conversation with his father and in the free study of the world, although often under the most hideous circumstances."

Separate Courts for Juvenile and Probation Officers in Rhode Island.—The State of Rhode Island, in 1898, enacted a law requiring its criminal courts to hold separate sessions for the trial of juvenile offenders. This act prohibited the confinement of any child under thirteen years of age in any police station with adult offenders, or the commitment of any such child to prison for any offence not punishable by death or imprisonment for life. It was ordered, that at every trial of a child upon a criminal charge, there should be present an agent either of the Board of State Charities and Correction, or of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, or of the St. Vincent de Paul Society; and the court might commit a child under thirteen to the custody of either of these three.

In 1899, another step was taken, in the passage of an act empowering the Board of Charities and Correction to appoint probation officers (of whom one must be a woman), removable at will, and authorizing the courts to place both juvenile and adult offenders under the control of these officers. A proviso was attached to the act, that no compensation, except for expenses, should be paid to any official of the state, or of any society, in receipt of a salary. The state board has power to discharge inmates of the State Reform School, on probation, to live at home or in families.

Massachusetts Child Labor Law.—As the result of twenty-five years of effort in Massachusetts, a stringent law has been passed thoroughly enforcing and practically eliminating child labor for wages in the state. In the early history of this class of legislation the objection and obstruction came chiefly from parents, who were more eager to increase the family income by a few dollars than to safeguard their children. Twenty years ago cases were known of children eight years old working sixty-six hours a week in factories. Such a condition could not now be found in the state. Wise legislation has been enacted substantially increasing the age limit, so that no child under fourteen shall be employed in any factory. The great textile and other industries are conducted with marked respect for the law, and "not only are the state inspectors of factories given the duty of seeing that its provisions are enforced, but the local school officers must also see that the provisions of the statute as to compulsory education are enforced as well. The two statutes and two sets of officers supplement one another."

Commission to Report on a State Reformatory in Connecticut.—The commission appointed by Governor Chamberlain, of Connecticut, whose duty it will be to investigate the needs for the establishment of a state reformatory, is meeting with unqualified praise from the principal papers in Connecticut. The chairman of the commission is Warden Garvin of the State Prison. The other members are Thomas D. Wells, of Hartford, editor of the *Hartford Post*, and for some years a member of the Prison Board of

Directors; Senator Cornelius Tracy, who is largely responsible for the act, which created the commission; Dr. William Ford, a member of the House of Representatives and editor of the *New Haven Register*.

The commission was appointed under a very liberal act, by which they are directed to examine all laws, conditions and customs pertaining to commitments to jails and the prisons of the state and to recommend such changes as are necessary to aid in the making of a reformatory. The commission is directed to select a site for the reformatory and to prepare plans and specifications. They are given latitude in regard to the study of the general question. The sum of fifty thousand dollars is put at their disposal.

The New Penitentiary Near Paris.—At Fresnes, about eight miles from Paris (France), a new penitentiary has been opened, the largest in the world, accommodating two thousand inmates. The buildings with the gardens cover half a square mile, the situation is beautiful and healthy. The houses have large windows and plenty of them, admitting plenty of fresh air and sunshine. A large number of shower baths are scattered throughout the buildings; the prisoners' food is abundant. They go to school and are allowed to work at their trades, and with the money earned to purchase any luxury they may select but tobacco. In fact, everything possible is done to develop the better side of their natures. The prisoners are kept separate, holding no communication with each other, so that they cannot recognize each other when released.

The Annual Meeting of the Connecticut State Prison Association elected Hon. Francis Wayland president for the twenty-seventh time. Among the names of the officers are Professor Henry W. Farnam, Elijah J. Steele, General Edward Harland and others. Their report shows 318 prisoners assisted by the association, in addition to this thirty-one from the jails were aided. The prisoners were given clothing and transportation to their homes, or to places where they could be employed, tools to enable them to work at their trades, and many were furnished board while employment was being secured for them. Great emphasis was laid by Secretary Taylor, in his report, upon the need of adapting the present system of sentencing to conform with the Indeterminate Sentence Law. As it is now, many prisoners come into prison with sentences so arranged that it is impossible to apply the principles of indeterminate sentence. In the case of a sentence of not less than ten nor more than twelve years under the operation of the Commutation Law the prisoner by good conduct earns 930 days and receives his discharge without parole before the minimum part of his sentence is reached. In cases of this kind it is not possible to apply the parole test. The same holds in sentences of not less than one year.

The probation system of the state is under the direction of the association, and up to September 30 they had appointed thirty-seven probation officers, two of them women. These officers have had, as yet, only two months' experience in the service. A probation committee from the association was appointed, to whom all questions concerning the probation service is to be referred.

The Whipping-Post in Delaware.—Two white and twelve black prisoners

were publicly whipped in the yard of the county workhouse of Wilmington on September 26, after which they were compelled to stand for an hour in the pillory, and were then "taken back to the workhouse to serve ten sentences of six years each." One wonders what the subsequent process of reformation in the workhouse will be, and whether the authorities have any theory of punishment or of reformation? What are the results of their strenuous method of correction? Does it, in fact, act as a deterrent? Is crime less prevalent in Delaware than in other states which have outgrown the whipping-post era of progressiveness? Is recidivism less frequent in Delaware than elsewhere? Are crimes of violence fewer proportionately than in other states? Or is there anything peculiar to the citizens of Delaware which necessitates this survival of mediæval methods of punishment? The questions raised above are thoroughly practical and they interest all who are concerned in the treatment of criminals.

"Jewish Charity."—In October appeared the first number of *Jewish Charity*, a monthly review published by the United Hebrew Charities of New York City, of which Dr. Lee K. Frankel is one of the editors. In an interesting opening article the editors point out the need of hearty co-operation among philanthropic Jews, which it is hoped the new publication will stimulate. Jewish charitable effort has its own field distinct from other philanthropic enterprises; first, because the needy Jew turns more readily to his brethren in faith, and, second, because the Jews of the upper classes have tacitly determined not to permit their poor to become objects of state charity. But, despite the fact that the Jews constitute one-fifth of the population of Greater New York, hitherto "all theoretic discussion of Jewish pauperism from anything like a scientific standpoint has emanated from persons not of the Jewish race." It is the editors' hope that with the publication of *Jewish Charity* the Jews themselves will be influenced to give a closer attention to the sociological conditions of their poor. It is the purpose of the new review to keep track of publications on Jewish charitable topics and of new men in Jewish charitable institutions and to record the work and progress of the United Hebrew Charities. This number contains also an article by Dr. Frankel on "Co-operation on the East Side," giving the outline of a proposed plan by which there shall be a number of district committees on the East Side, composed of intelligent residents of that section, to assist the officers of the United Hebrew Charities to care for the poor. Maurice Fishberg has an article on consumption, the increase of which, among Jews, he attributes to overcrowding in tenements and sweatshops. Attention is called in this number to the new Winter School of Philanthropy in New York, and an outline of the proposed course is given. All interested in philanthropic work and in the intelligent discussion of its results and its needs will welcome *Jewish Charity* and wish it success.

Graft.—Several very interesting articles have appeared in various magazines of late exposing corruption in the administration of the municipal affairs of certain American cities. None of them have attempted to show the historical origin of this corruption. A treatise on the history of graft would form a valuable addition to current sociological literature, but it

would be a task of enormous difficulty to gather and arrange the materials for it.

Political influence is the result of the possession of power to influence political action. In a democracy, it is conditioned upon the ability to deliver votes at a popular election. Its extent is measured by the number of votes controlled, whether in a state, county, city, ward or precinct; just as financial power depends upon pecuniary resources and credit.

Many considerations affect the voter: his principles, prejudices, sentiments; and above all, his interests. The average man votes for the measures and the men whose victory will, he thinks, add to his worldly wealth, or insure him official position of some sort. No man knows the truth of this observation so well as the trained politician, with the possible exception of the professional corruptionist. Between these two there is apt to be a mutual understanding, if not a formal alliance.

There are, therefore, two principal methods of influencing elections: the purchase of votes, by the direct use of money, and the holding out to the voter the hope of office, in the event of political success. The governor of one of the largest and most powerful states in the Union once said to the writer, in all candor and sincerity, that, from his point of view, the practical objection to civil service reform is that it deprives the party of one of these resources, and that its tendency, therefore, is to place practical politics on the lower level of actual bribery.

In the conduct of a political campaign, money is a necessity, for legitimate uses, in order to pay the cost of printing and of public meetings, and of making preliminary canvasses and "getting out the vote." But a large portion of the funds raised ostensibly for these purposes is in fact paid to voters. Where such funds are swelled by means of a resort to political assessments upon office holders and upon candidates for office, which is an almost universal practice, those who are held up and blackmailed naturally expect to get their money back, by hook or by crook, and they very often do so. They repay themselves for their outlay, if they have an opportunity, with interest far in excess of the legal rates.

Men who are not themselves dishonest wink at these practices, because their consciences have become blunted by familiarity with them, and because opposition to them involves risk without the hope of corresponding and compensatory personal advantage. When an election cannot be carried by the aid of promises and of cash, there remain the two resources of fraudulent voting and falsifying the returns, thus defeating the popular will, which is virtual treason, one of the highest of crimes.

So much for corruption in elections. What of legislative corruption, and corrupt executive administration?

Let us first speak of the latter, because it is purely official, and begin with the question of appointments to subordinate executive positions.

Nothing can be clearer than that the carrying out of corrupt bargains is itself corruption. The downfall of the Roman Empire is traceable to the sale of offices. Yet political patronage, even in free America, is regarded as a personal asset, a perquisite. Senators and Representatives in Congress

boldly say to the President, "This appointment belongs to me"; and against the names of the employees in the departments at Washington entered on the secret official registers are placed the names of those at whose request they have been appointed. A Senator went, one day, to a former member of the Cabinet and said, "Mr. Secretary, I want Blank appointed to a position in this department." "But, Mr. Senator, there are no vacancies." "Make one, then!" The secretary touched a bell, called a messenger, and sent for the appointment book, which he handed to his unwelcome visitor, with the remark, "Choose the man to be discharged;" which the Senator refused to do, and went away disgruntled. He wanted the secretary to pluck his chestnuts from the fire, not to involve himself in a row with a colleague. If political recommendations for appointment were of qualified persons only, the evil would not be so great; but qualification for the discharge of their duties is too often a minor consideration. Competitive examinations, intended to operate as a bar to improper appointments, are after all an ineffectual check upon the practice here complained of.

This practice pervades all branches of our complex political system. It prevails in states, counties and municipalities. The appointees acknowledge and recognize a divided dependence, a double obligation; to the power behind the appointing power first, and after that to the duties devolving upon them by law. Discipline is rendered difficult, and tends to become lax. The public does not get value received for the salaries paid. It cannot be otherwise.

The root of the maladministration of so many of our public charitable and correctional institutions is here laid bare. The well-being of the inmates is sacrificed to the greed of place-hunters and the corrupt facility of those who have places to give.

As to legislative corruption, it is hard to estimate its amount, because it is not easy to unearth it. One thing is clear; there would be no bribe-takers, if there were no bribe-givers. The latter are equally guilty with the former, no matter what anodyne they may administer to their consciences.

City councils and county boards are legislative kindergartens—training schools for the general assembly; and state legislatures are a primary class for Congress. The lessons learned in them affect the pupil's entire subsequent career.

The corrupt (or at least the corrupted) members of a legislative body usually constitute a small minority, but they may hold the balance of power. The larger the area (measured in population or in square miles) represented in this body, the less of corruption; this is the rule, with occasional exceptions.

Much unmerited obloquy has been heaped upon the heads of legislators, because of the combinations by which so many important measures are passed. Compromise and concession are essential in all associated human activity. Combinations are not corrupt, unless they spring from corrupt motives or have a corrupt purpose.

One fertile source of legislative corruption, especially in our city and county governments, is the exercise of the powers of appointment and administration by them. A legislative body should, in theory at least, have

no patronage at its command. If this were the universal practice, the county and municipal institutions of most states would be better than they are.

Finally, no survey of the actual situation is complete which does not take account of the fact that politicians and public functionaries, in favoring graft, reflect the will of their constituents. Two classes of citizens are benefited, as they imagine, by dishonesty in the administration of government; first, the petty thieves; and, second, business men with schemes for whose successful execution political action is essential, as, for instance, in the form of charters granted, or special privileges of some description, for which they are willing to pay. To these must be added such as believe that the toleration of open and flagrant immorality attracts rural customers, and so adds to the wealth of the community. In a city notoriously corrupt, a gentleman who had exceptional opportunities for knowing what goes on beneath the surface of public affairs, being himself employed as counsel for a department of the government, once said to me, that if the people of that municipality were given, for a single term, a government absolutely honest in all its dealings with individuals and with the public, they would bury it, at the next election, beyond the hope of resurrection.²

The National Humane Association.—When the American Humane Association holds its annual meeting early in November, a carefully prepared plan to convert it into a huge national organization will be presented and probably adopted. This association has existed for many years as an annual convention of societies for the prevention of cruelty—and nothing more. Their delegates attended to exchange views, ask questions and receive information about their common work. No meeting except this annual one was ever held. During the recess a feeble attempt was occasionally made by its officers and committees to print and disseminate humane literature, but never with any marked success; first, for lack of funds, as people generally prefer to sustain the direct legitimate work of prevention as conducted efficiently by our societies in their respective states; and, second, because the newspaper and magazine literature is all that is required at the present time for the purpose. Last year some of those very active in the association prepared and urged an incorporation of the association as a national body, with practically the same features as the one now to be adopted. (1) The name is to be changed to "THE NATIONAL HUMANE ASSOCIATION." (2) Individuals and not societies are to be the corporators. (3) The incorporation is to be in the District of Columbia. (4) Its work and purposes are those of our present existing societies. (5) Which it is to stimulate and urge in enforcing laws and orders. (6) It is to aid in securing legislation. (7) It is to disseminate literature and in "extension of humane ideas" is to distribute and give away "humane pictures, lanterns, slides, medals, and other things"! (8) The bill then authorizes the creation of a board of trustees to receive and hold property *including legacies*, with limited personal liability. Lastly (9) the bill authorizes the appointment of agents to enforce the laws governing the transportation of animals, a work peculiarly within the province of our state societies for the prevention of cruelty to animals.

² Contributed by Frederick Howard Wines.

If this bill should become a law, over a million dollars would be needed to make the plan in the slightest degree effective. Where is the money to come from? The usual answer in the organization of a trust is made,—“it will come in due time.” How far a credulous man might be willing to donate liberally to such a corporation for such purposes remains to be seen. One thing is certain, the treasuries of our own societies stand a fair chance of suffering from legacies diverted from them to this huge anti-cruelty trust.

Now as to the bill, generally. Its object is to create a grand national corporation for the prevention of cruelty to animals and children in humble imitation of a national society for the prevention of cruelty to children in England, which, under a different form of government, stands on a very different footing. The limited territory of England compared with that of our country renders such a corporation feasible under the English law. Here the work in one state alone exceeds that in England in a year. True, the liberality of the English people in the cause of humanity is alike large and certainly most commendable; but they have only one society to support, which derives no revenue from the Crown and legacies to it do not detract from any other humane work. But the corporate object of this “Trust” is really to interfere with the work of our societies throughout the United States. It absorbs the object of their creation and they are simply made the exponent of its ideas. As in similar trusts, they retain their corporate existence, but really are directed and governed by the trust. The measure is a very dangerous usurpation of the right of individual states to create corporations therein for the enforcement of their own state laws. Congress has nothing whatever to do with the penal laws of any state nor with their enforcement. The subject does not properly belong to the Federal Government. The proviso in the bill for meeting anywhere in the United States is without a precedent. To create such an irresponsible corporation, with a mere agent located at Washington for the purposes indicated, is not only mischievous in theory, but deadly in results. Inexperienced and untried men will annoy our societies by perpetual suggestions and interference with local legislation; for while in general our anti-cruelty laws are uniform, yet the nature and extent of these acts necessarily differ in the localities which they affect.

The New York convention of our societies recently repeated their disapproval of the whole scheme and refused to send delegates or proxies to the ensuing annual meeting of the American Humane Association. The parent society of the whole world, the New York Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, has also very forcibly defined its opposition to the measure, which, if carried, will probably disrupt the whole association as now constituted. Trusts of any kind are not popular at the present time. Their extension into the domain of philanthropy is to be dreaded.⁸

The National Prison Congress of 1903.—The Annual Congress of the National Prison Association was opened this year at Louisville, Ky., on the evening of Saturday, October 3, and adjourned on the following Thursday. The value of such a gathering, as was insisted at the closing session, is to

⁸ Contributed by Elbridge T. Gerry.

be found in its influence, first, upon the delegates in attendance; second, upon the community in which its discussions are held, and third, upon students and the reading public, through the ultimate publication of its proceedings. The second of these forms of usefulness has always been regarded as of special importance, so that the prospect of it has determined from time to time the choice of the place of meeting. In this instance, as in some earlier years, the results in this respect have been disappointing. The attendance of citizens of Louisville was small. The great Kentucky Horse Show, the neighboring drill camp of the state militia, and the city campaign for municipal offices, all of which competed for their attention, diverted them from it, and eclipsed it as attractions and as subjects for comment. Yet a number of thoughtful minds were won by the discussions to a new and real interest in the reform of penal law and of its administration; and it may be hoped that this interest will, in some cases, be permanent. It must be confessed, however, that no such impression was made by the congress upon the public opinion of Kentucky, as its managers had been justified in expecting.

In every other respect, this annual congress was by far the most important and successful ever held. Almost two hundred delegates were on hand, representing twenty-four states of the Union and the Dominion of Canada. Sixty-eight of these are wardens, jailors, or, under some other title, executive officers of penal institutions, in direct personal charge of their inmates. Thirty-nine, at least, are state officers or members of boards, in control of such institutions. Among the rest were judges of criminal courts, sheriffs, prosecuting attorneys, probation officers, and others charged with the administration of penal law. There were also delegates from private associations and societies for the protection of dependent children and of discharged convicts, and a number of representative students of social science. But the constitution of the congress is changed indeed, since the time, only a few years ago, when it consisted almost wholly of volunteer philanthropists; when not five prison wardens in the United States could be persuaded to enter it; and when the actual custodians of the condemned, and the "practical-minded" public at large, were almost unanimous in the chilling indifference with which they regarded the small school of "sentimental theorists" calling themselves the National Prison Association.

If such founders of the association as Dr. E. C. Wines, of New York, and Rutherford B. Hayes, of Ohio, could now return to life and look upon the institution they created, the great surprise for them would lie in the character of the prison wardens who are its main support. To keep in subjection by force and terror a throng of desperate outcasts, to make their compulsory labor profitable to the state, while the law holds them in bondage, and then to turn them out, one by one, to choose between the hopeless struggle of the jail-bird for decent existence and a return to crime—was this ever the ideal of a just and efficient prison-keeper? If so, no one would suspect it, on seeing the wardens and superintendents in this gathering. Every man of them seems to be in the work because of his belief in the capacity, even of fallen humanity, for good. Every one of them seems to be an earnest student of his profession, seeking light from all sources upon the best methods, in

its practice, of serving the state and its wards. Among them are men of personal power, of broad culture, of original thought and of a large benevolence; characters which would administer with honor and distinction any private or public trust. And out of their rich experience and practical studies they contributed many papers and discussions which will give permanent value to the volume of proceedings.

Among the questions which received special attention, and excited the greatest interest, were these: By what methods and agencies can the state act most efficiently in preventing crime? What can be done to make public schools more useful in training children for citizenship? How should "tramps" be dealt with, especially upon the railroads? What is the value of the probation system, as now on trial in many states, after the example of Massachusetts; and how far can the principle be extended to advantage? To what extent is discipline in penal institutions injured by political influences? How can public opinion be aroused to the necessity of making all appointments for fitness alone? What can be done to prevent jails and prisons in which short terms are served from continuing to be the recruiting agencies of the criminal class? How far can industry, orderly discipline, and moral influences be introduced and maintained in them? What measures should be taken by the Federal and state governments to remedy the confusion and worthlessness which now prevail in criminal statistics; and to secure a trustworthy collection and treatment of them? What improvements can be made in the laws for the disposition of professional, habitual and hereditary criminals?

But, indeed, there are few topics, in the whole range of law and administration relating to crime, which were not illuminated in some degree by the discussions. The chief qualification to the satisfaction felt in these was the sense of incompleteness; the lack of time. Had the valuable papers and memoirs, prepared in advance of the meeting, been printed and placed in the hands of members on their arrival, so that they could be studied at leisure, and the hours of the sessions be given to criticism, application and debate, the congress would have been far more fruitful. It is to be hoped that this method will be adopted hereafter.⁴

⁴ Contributed by Charlton T. Lewis.